



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,422	08/02/2001	Mun Leong Wong	70007938-2	7468

7590 08/31/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

LEE, PHILIP C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 08/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/922,422

Applicant(s)

WONG ET AL.

Examiner

Philip C. Lee

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

1. This action is responsive to the amendment and remarks filed on June 13, 2005.
2. Claims 1-10 and 12 are presented for examination and claim 11 and 13 are canceled.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. code not included in this office action can be found in a prior office action.
4. Applicant's election without traverse of in the reply filed on 06/13/2005 is acknowledged.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

6. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

7. Claims 1-3, 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0177453 (hereinafter Chen).

8. As per claim 1, Chen taught the invention as claimed for using a mobile device to transfer one of a plurality of data being stored in a sub-computer system to an target computer system, comprising:

creating an instruction in the mobile device (i.e. forward \$mail.1 qT) (page 6, paragraph 100), wherein the instruction comprises providing a user name and password for accessing the sub-computer system (i.e. providing a username and password from the user profile (e.g. Chen)) (page 6, paragraphs 85-100), selecting a first piece of data to be transferred and designating the target computer system to which the first piece of data is to be transferred (page 4, paragraph 55);

sending the instruction from the mobile device to a gateway via a Public Switched Telephone Network (inherently comprised in Networks 202, 206, 216 of fig. 1), wherein the gateway converts the instruction into an HTTP format suitable to be transmitted in the Internet (fig. 1; page 3, paragraph 38); (Note that it is inherent that instruction (i.e. WAP instruction) from the mobile device must be converted by the gateway (208, fig. 1) in order to be transmitted through the Internet)

sending the instruction in the HTTP format from the gateway to a central computer system via the Internet (page 3, paragraph 38; page 4, paragraph 55);  
informing the sub-computer system of the selected first piece of data to be transferred and the designated target computer system to which the first piece of data to be transferred by the central computer system (page 4, paragraph 55);  
accessing the sub-computer system using the provided user name and password by the central computer system (i.e. accessing stock quote T at stock quote site (i.e. sub-computer system) using user name and password from user profile) (page 4, paragraphs 54-55, 58; page 6, paragraphs 85-87, 100); and  
transmitting the first piece of data from the sub-computer system to the target computer system via the Internet according to the instruction (page 3, paragraph 39; page 4, paragraph 55).

9. As per claim 2, Chen taught the invention as claimed in claim 1 above. Chen further taught a method comprising:

storing information relating to identifications of the plurality of data (e.g. sms.cmd.q=quote) in a central computer system (page 6, paragraph 96); and  
sending said information from the central computer system to the mobile device for designating the first piece of data (page 4, paragraphs 55-59). (Note that the cmd q can be used for designating the quote to another device)

10. As per claim 3, Chen taught the invention as claimed in claim 2 above. Chen further taught using the mobile device to request the central computer system to send said information (page 4, paragraph 55).

11. As per claim 5, Chen taught the invention as claimed in claim 1 above. Chen further taught that an identification of the target computer system is known to the central computer system, and wherein the step of designating the target computer system includes specifying its identification in the instruction (page 6, paragraphs 85-100) (e.g. target computer mail.1).

12. As per claim 12, Chen taught the invention substantially as claimed for using a mobile device to transfer one of a plurality of data being stored in a sub-computer system to an target system, comprising:

storing information relating to identifications of the plurality of data (e.g. sms.cmd.q=quote) in a central computer system (page 6, paragraph 96);  
using the mobile device to request the central computer system to send said information to the mobile device (page 4, paragraph 55); and  
sending said information from the central computer system to the mobile device (page 4, paragraph 55).  
creating an instruction in the mobile device (i.e. forward \$mail.1 qT) (page 6, paragraph 100), wherein the instruction comprises providing a user name and password for accessing the sub-computer system (i.e. providing a username and password from the user profile (e.g. Chen)) (page 6, paragraphs 85-100), selecting a first piece of data to be

transferred and designating the target computer system to which the first piece of data is to be transferred (page 4, paragraph 55);

sending the instruction from the mobile device to a gateway via a Public Switched Telephone Network (inherently comprised in Networks 202, 206, 216 of fig. 1), wherein the gateway converts the instruction into an HTTP format suitable to be transmitted in the Internet (fig. 1; page 3, paragraph 38); (Note that it is inherent that instruction (i.e. WAP instruction) from the mobile device must be converted by the gateway (208, fig. 1) in order to be transmitted through the Internet)

sending the instruction in the HTTP format from the gateway to a central computer system via the Internet (page 3, paragraph 38; page 4, paragraph 55);

informing the sub-computer system of the selected first piece of data to be transferred and the designated target computer system to which the first piece of data to be transferred by the central computer system (page 4, paragraph 55);

accessing the sub-computer system using the provided user name and password by the central computer system (i.e. accessing stock quote T at stock quote site (i.e. sub-computer system) using user name and password from user profile) (page 4, paragraphs 54-55, 58; page 6, paragraphs 85-87, 100); and

transmitting the first piece of information from the sub-computer system to the target computer system via the Internet according to the instruction (page 3, paragraph 39; page 4, paragraph 55).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen.

15. As per claim 6, although Chen did not specifically detailing the location of the first piece of data in the instruction, however, Chen taught designating the first piece of data in the instruction (e.g. command quote T) for retrieval of data (page 4, paragraph 55). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the location of the first piece of data in the instruction because by doing so it would increase the retrieval time in Chen's system.

16. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Official Notice.

11. As per claim 7, although Chen did not specifically teach including the target computer's internet protocol address in the instruction, however, official notice is taken that the concept of



Art Unit: 2154

designating a receiver by specifying the receiver's internet protocol address is known and accepted in the art (e.g., designating destination IP address in packet header). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the destination Internet protocol address in the instruction to enable routing of information in the Internet.

17. Claims 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Singhal, U.S. Patent 6,256,666 (hereinafter Singhal).

18. Singhal was cited in the last office action.

19. As per claim 8, Chen taught the invention as claimed in claim 1 above. Although, Chen taught transmitting information from the mobile device to the gateway via the Public Switched Telephone Network and from the gateway to the central computer system via the Internet (page 3, paragraph 38), however, Chen did not teach composing a first piece of information in a mobile device. Singhal taught a similar system comprising

composing a first piece of information in the mobile device (col. 5, lines 8-16);

transmitting the first piece of information from the mobile device to the central computer system via the first network (col. 5, lines 13-25);

generating a file in the central computer system by combining the first piece of

information with the first piece of data retrieved (col. 5, lines 55-57; col. 6, lines 43-45);

and

transmitting the file to the target computer system (col. 7, lines 49-54).

20. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chen and Singhal because Singhal's teaching of composing a first piece of information in the mobile device would increase the efficiency of Singhal's system by allowing client devices to compose messages for remotely manipulate files stored in a server (col. 5, lines 8-16).

21. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Keeney et al, U.S. Patent 6,748,471 (hereinafter Keeney).

22. Keeney was cited in the last office action.

21. As per claim 4, Chen taught the invention as claimed in claim 1 above. Chen further taught comprising:

sending the first piece of data from the sub-computer system to the central computer system according to said part of the instruction (page 3, paragraph 39);  
saving the first piece of data under a filename in the central computer system (i.e. archiving) (page 3, paragraph 40).

Chen did not teach informing the target computer of the filename by the central computer system and downloading the data by the target computer according to the filename. Keeney taught a similar system comprising:

informing the target computer system of the file name by the central computer system (col. 12, lines 41-49); and

downloading the first piece of data from the central computer system by the target computer system according to the filename (col. 7, lines 35-38; col. 12, lines 41-49).

22. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chen and Keeney because Keeney's of informing the target device of the filenames would increase the system alertness in Chen's system by notifying the user of the available documents for download (col. 12, lines 50-55).

23. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen and Singhal in view of Sragner, U.S. Patent 6,272,485 (hereinafter Sragner).

24. Sragner was cited in the last office action.

25. As per claim 9, Chen and Singhal taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 8 above. Chen and Singhal did not teach that the target computer is designated by an email address. Sragner taught designating a recipient by specifying an email address relating to the recipient (col. 6, lines 48-57).

26. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chen, Singhal and Sragner because Sragner's

teaching of specifying an email address would increase the functionality of Chen's and Singhal's systems by enabling data to be routed to the recipient as electronic message.

27. As per claim 10, Chen, Singhal and Sragner taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 9 above. Sragner further taught wherein the step of generating the file includes attaching the first piece of data within the email (col. 6, lines 48-57).

28. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 and 12, filed 6/13/05, have been fully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive and are moot in view of new ground of rejection.

29. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

30. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-3967. Any

Application/Control Number: 09/922,422


Page 12

Art Unit: 2154

inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the

Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Philip Lee

 JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100